

REMARKS:

The Examiner states:

The drawings are objected to because Figures 3 and 6 are inconsistent with the descriptions thereof on page 4, lines 24-25 and 29, i.e. a method is not shown and a nursing bra is not shown. (p. 2 Office Action)

Thus Applicants believe that the amendments to the specification at Page 4, lines 24-25 and line 29, and Page 7, lines 24-25 and now put this application in allowable form.

The Examiner states:

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract, a copy of the PCT abstract, is acceptable for filing purposes only. (p. 2 Office Action)

Thus, the Applicants believe that the replacement abstract now puts this application in allowable form.

Claims 18 and 21 are presented for examination, with claims 1-17, 19-20 and 22-25 having been cancelled. The Examiner states that claims 18 and 21 are “allowable subject matter” if Applicants address the Examiner’s rejection stated in Paragraphs 8-9 (p. 11 Office Action). Specifically, the Examiner states:

The prior art references, either alone or in combination, do not teach a method of leakage prevention which consists only of the steps claimed in claims 18 and 21. (p. 11 Office Action)

In response, Applicants amended claim 18 based on the Examiner’s suggestion of “placing and then depressing a specific shield of silicone rubber compounds of low durometer and then pressing the shield against the skin surrounding the nipple and keeping it in contact therewith without adhesives due to inherent tackiness of silicone rubber compounds of low durometer alone.” (p. 5 Office Action). Consequently, based on the Examiner’s statement, claims 18 and 21 are now condition for allowance.

Applicants believe that cancellation of claims 1-17 and 19-20 which were not directed to the method of leakage prevention, and cancellation of 22-25, in addition to amendment of claim 18, which has been amended to conform to the disclosure, and claim 21 are now in allowable form.

Amended claim 18 and previously presented claim 21 are fully supported by the original filed specification and thus, no new matter has been added. For example, the support for the amendment to a shield “wherein the inner membrane is sufficiently low in durometer to allow adherence to the skin and the exterior frame provides support and shape for the shield” can be found at Paragraph 10 of the printed publication.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that claims 18 and 21 now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Applicants thus respectfully request that the instant Amendment be entered and that all pending claims be allowed and this application be entered and this application be passed to issuance.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

The Examiner’s attention to this matter is greatly appreciated

Respectfully submitted,
GREENBERG TRAURIG

Dated: January 21, 2009

By: /barry j schindler/
Barry J. Schindler
Registration No. 32,938

Barry J. Schindler, Esq.
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
Met Life Building
200 Park Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, New York 10166
Phone: 212-801-2244
Fax: 212-801-6400